DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 229 UD 029 304

AUTHOR Hinton, Richard, Ed.
TITLE Shaping America's Future II: Proceedings of the National Forum To Develop Collaborative Approaches to Providing Early Child Care and Transforming American Society (New York, New York, September 25, 1989).
INSTITUTION National Educational Service, Bloomington, IN.
SPONS AGENCY AT&T Foundation, New York, NY.; City Univ. of New York, N.Y.; General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.
PUB DATE [89]
NOTE 53p.; For volumes I-III, see UD 029 303-305.
AVAILABLE FROM Director of Publications, National Educational Service, 1610 West Third Street, P.O. Box 8, Bloomington, IN 47402.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Children; Day Care Centers; *Disadvantaged Youth; Early Childhood Education; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Cooperation; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Employer Supported Day Care; Futures (of Society); Policy Formation; Professional Continuing Education; Public Policy; Public Schools; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS Action Plans; Forums

ABSTRACT

Twenty of America's foremost leaders from business, education, and government met to develop a strategy for assisting the country's disadvantaged children and to send an action plan to President Bush for consideration at his education summit. The meeting's goal was to format active and practical models for the following basic ideas developed at an earlier meeting: (1) any environment that corporations help to establish or fund for early childhood education should include a component for disadvantaged children from the community in addition to employees' children; (2) collaborative efforts among corporations, legislators, and higher education and public school teachers would be necessary for the successful implementation of day-care and early education programs; (3) corporations must educate their managers and employees about the importance of supporting and being involved in educational systems; and (4) existing resources must be utilized in an improved manner to guarantee that those resources can deliver services where they are most needed. Acting on these ideas, the forum participants endorsed a proposal to make the nation's schools the "hub" of a comprehensive system of child care and early childhood education. The panel also set the framework for an interdisciplinary model for the training of business and education leaders at the university level. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358229

SHAPING AMERICA'S FUTURE II

A National Forum to Develop Collaborative Approaches to Providing Early Child Care and Transforming American Society

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. R. Shin
Natnl Educ Assn Semi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD029304

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SHAPING AMERICA'S FUTURE II

A National Forum to Develop
Collaborative Approaches to Providing
Early Child Care and Transforming
American Society

Featuring:

Ernest H. Mueller
Alan M. Blankstein
W. Edwards Deming
Amina Abdur-Rahman
Beverly L. Anderson
Ezra Bowen
James M. Cooper
Lee Dunham
Keith B. Geiger
Cleveland Hammonds
David Haselkorn
Helené Hodges
Bernard Mecklowitz
Arvin F. Mueller
Ruth E. Randall
John W. Rosenblum
Thomas A. Shannon
Joseph Shenker
Michael D. Usdan
Edward Zigler

From:

The National Educational Service Foundation
1821 West Third St., Suite 212
Bloomington, IN 47402
(812) 336-7700 or 1-800-73-FORUM

Edited by Richard Hinton

Shaping America's Future II was funded in part by:

AT&T
City University of New York
General Motors

Special thanks to Esquire Reporting Company for providing transcribing services.

Introduction

Twenty of America's foremost leaders from business, education, and government met at City University of New York (CUNY), New York City, on September 25, 1989. Their task was to develop a strategy for assisting the country's burgeoning group of disadvantaged children and to send an action plan to President Bush for consideration at his education summit. The meeting, titled "Shaping America's Future II," was sponsored by the National Educational Service Foundation (NESF) and was underwritten in part by AT&T, CUNY, and General Motors. Transcripts of the forum have been edited to prepare this report.

Shaping America's Future II's goal was to formulate active and practical models for four basic ideas developed at Shaping America's Future I held in February 1989. These ideas were:

*Any environment that corporations help to establish or fund for early childhood education ultimately should include a component for disadvantaged children from the community in addition to employees' children. These centers should be developed with the assistance of community service organizations. Educators and parents should take the lead in staffing and determining a healthy structure for the educational environment.

*Collaborative efforts among corporations, legislators, and higher and public school educators would be necessary for the successful implementation of day-care and early education programs.

*Corporations must educate their managers and employees about the importance of supporting and being directly involved in educational systems through lobbying, donations, volunteerism, and serving on school boards. Building awareness and educating future business leaders about their corporate responsibility to provide leadership for educating the disadvantaged must be addressed in college and university business school curriculums.

*Existing resources must be utilized in an improved manner to guarantee that those resources can deliver services where they are needed most.

Acting upon these ideas, the participants in Shaping America's Future II endorsed a proposal to make the nation's schools the "hub" of a comprehensive system of child care and early childhood education. Schools, the panel concluded, should extend their hours to operate before- and after-school child-care programs. They should offer early childhood education, health screening, training for child-care providers, and programs to educate parents about prenatal and early child care.

Panelists envisioned a plan that would "take systems that have an impact upon the child, tie them all together, and see that schools have an impact upon all those systems." Although they acknowledged that it would be unrealistic for schools to deliver all the services that such a system would imply, the panelists suggested that schools should become "the child-coordinating agency . . . for the overall well-being of the child."

These changes in the American school, the panelists said, would depend a great deal on the advocacy of corporations who were called on to lobby for child-care legislation and to implement child-care programs and employee-leave policies that respond to the needs of working parents.

The panel also set the framework for an interdisciplinary model for the training of business and education leaders at the university level. The deans of business and education at the University of Virginia made a commitment to further develop--and then pilot--this model.

It is the hope of the NESF that the edited reports from these two seminal conferences will be valuable resources and guides for state governments, corporations, social agencies, and local educational systems to ensure that the establishment of quality day-care centers provides a solid foundation for transforming America's schools and society.

Shaping America's Future II

The Participants

Moderators

Ernest H. Mueller
Executive Director, National Educational Service Foundation

Dr. Ernest H. Mueller brings thirty-seven years of practical, hands-on educational experience--ranging from teacher to superintendent in districts of 3,000 to 36,000 students--to his role of director of the National Educational Service Foundation (NESF) and moderator of the *Shaping America's Future* conferences. Most recently, Dr. Mueller was superintendent of the Oak Park, Illinois, elementary schools. He is highly regarded as a consultant on year-round schools, central office reorganization, and the design of corporate community schools. In 1988, Dr. Mueller was honored by Loyola University and U.S. Capital Corporation for outstanding contributions to excellence in education.

Alan M. Blankstein
President, National Educational Service Foundation

Founder and president of the National Educational Service Foundation, Alan M. Blankstein was previously marketing director for Phi Delta Kappa, a 135,000-member educational organization which produces a leading journal of educational thought and leadership. Mr. Blankstein founded the NESF, an educational service dedicated to improving the quality of education nationally, in response to his own experiences as a disadvantaged child, growing up in foster care in the inner city. Mr. Blankstein attributes his ability to complete his education and succeed in business to the availability of scholarships and the guidance and support he received from the system of social agencies that intervened and mentored him during his youth.

Panel One

Amina Abdur-Rahman
Deputy Chancellor for External Programs and Community, New York City Partnership

Amina Abdur-Rahman, formerly Vice President for Education and Youth Employment at the New York City Partnership, is now Deputy Chancellor for

External Programs and Community. She is a member of the Governor's Advisory Council on Youth Employment, the Black Leadership Commission on AIDS, and the Education Committee of the New York Academy of Science. She has served as Senior Education Policy Advisor to Manhattan Borough President, David Dinkins; Director of Education Programs for the New York Urban League, one of the country's oldest and largest civil rights and social service organizations; and is the former head of the Educational Priorities Panel, a New York City coalition of thirty education, parent, and civic organizations renowned for its budget and management studies of the New York City Board of Education. From 1979 to 1984, Ms. Abdur-Rahman was the producer and moderator of *Education Alert*, a weekly New York City radio talk show.

Lee Dunham
President, Harlem McDonald's

A former policeman, Lee Dunham opened the first McDonald's restaurant in New York City in 1971 and has since added seven more stores to his operation. In addition, he is a board member and past president of the National Black McDonald's Owner/Operators Association, an organization of about 200 Black owner/operators whose primary goal is to increase Black participation at all levels of the McDonald's Corporation. Mr. Dunham is active in the New York City Board of Education and the Youth Task Force. He is a recipient of the Boys Choir of Harlem's Heroes Award for his dedication to helping youth.

Keith B. Geiger
President, National Education Association

Keith B. Geiger, a high school mathematics and science teacher from Livonia, Michigan, was elected president of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1989. He served as vice president of that organization since 1983. Throughout his 25-year career in education, Mr. Geiger has worked in numerous professional, political, and negotiating capacities at every level of NEA. He previously served as President of the Michigan Education Association and the Livonia (Michigan) Education Association. He was a member of NEA's 1976 Presidential Screening and Endorsement Committee and has been a delegate to two Democratic National Conventions. Mr. Geiger is currently a member of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Executive Committee, the Labor Committee of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday Commission, and the Commission on Presidential Scholars. He has served five times as a

delegate to meetings of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

Arvin F. Mueller
Vice President and Group Director, Chevrolet-Pontiac, Canada Group, General Motors

A graduate of Michigan State University, Mr. Mueller began his 25-year career at General Motors as a junior engineer for the Chevrolet Motor Division. Here, he was involved in experimental and developmental engineering before being promoted to assistant staff engineer, and then, in 1979, to staff engineer for chassis and component parts. Mr. Mueller also has served as chief engineer for the Powertrain Product Team, Director of Production and Manufacturing Engineering, and Divisional Manager for the Buick-Oldsmobile-Cadillac Group Powertrain Product Team where he supervised engine and component plants in Flint, Lansing, and Livonia, Michigan. He is active in numerous civic organizations and has a particular interest in early childhood education.

Panel Two

Helené Hodges
Director, Research and Information, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Dr. Helené Hodges has been a practitioner in the field of learning styles for fifteen years as a school director, program specialist/evaluator, national consultant, and classroom teacher. Her implementation of learning and reading styles theory, concept, and practice has been geared to children with handicapping conditions, non-achievers, and the potential dropouts of our school systems. Dr. Hodges has founded, designed, implemented, and supervised two highly successful urban, inner city learning/reading styles-based instructional programs: Madison Prep and the Key School. In addition, she has engaged in extensive evaluation of school and district-wide programs and is a specialist in grant and proposal writing. Dr. Hodges has served as a national consultant and in-service administrator/teacher-trainer to school districts throughout the country.

Bernard Mecklowitz
Former Chancellor, New York City Public Schools System

Dr. Bernard Mecklowitz, a product of the New York City public school system and graduate of the City University system, is in his thirty-fifth year of service to the children of the New York City public schools. He started his career in 1954 as a substitute teacher and has served as assistant principal, junior high school principal, superintendent of Community School District #1 on Manhattan's lower east side, Deputy Chancellor, and Chancellor of the New York City Public School System. Dr. Mecklowitz has served as President of the Association of New York City Superintendents, Associate Professor of Education at the Graduate School of Pace University, and is a member of the New York State Commissioner's Advisory Panel of School Administrators. He was named Outstanding Educator of the Year by the Doctorate Association of New York Educators in 1982 and Educator of the Year by Phi Delta Kappa in 1984.

Ruth E. Randall
Commissioner of Education, State of Minnesota

As Commissioner of Education for Minnesota, Dr. Ruth E. Randall provides leadership and management of the state's 436 public school districts, a budget of three billion dollars for the biennium, and a statewide professional staff of 45,000. Previously, she served as Assistant Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, and Superintendent in the Rosemount/Apple Valley School District. Dr. Randall is commissioner of the Education Commission of States and a board member on the National Board of Professional Teaching, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the American Forum.

Joseph Shenker
President, Bank Street College of Education

Dr. Joseph Shenker is the fifth president of Bank Street College and founding president of LaGuardia Community College, the only cooperative education college in New York State. Dr. Shenker has also served as Acting President of Hunter and Kingsborough Community colleges and as Dean for Community Colleges under the auspices of the Chancellor's Office, City University of New York. He has been Senior Advisor to the New York City Board of Education, and, in September 1988, was asked by Chancellor Richard Green to chair the Steering Committee on University/Schools

Collaboratives. In addition, he is a chairman of the Liberty Scholarship Advisory Committee.

Edward Zigler
Sterling Professor of Psychology, Yale University

After working as a clinical psychologist at Worcester State Hospital in Massachusetts and Director of the University of Missouri Child Diagnostic Center, Dr. Edward Zigler joined the Department of Psychology at Yale University. He is currently Sterling Professor of Psychology, head of the psychology section of the Yale Child Study Center, and Director of Yale's Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy. Professor Zigler was the first director of the Office of Child Development and chief of the Children's Bureau. He was an architect of the Head Start program, Project Follow Through, Home Start, the Child and Family Resource Program, and the Child Development Associate Program. He frequently testifies before Congress and has served as a consultant to a number of cabinet-rank officers. Professor Zigler has garnered awards and honors from numerous organizations including the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Orthopsychiatric Association, and the National Association for Retarded Citizens.

Panel Three

Ezra Bowen
Editorial Director and Executive Vice President, *Times Mirror Magazines*

Ezra Bowen is Editorial Director and Executive Vice President of *Times Mirror Magazines*. .He has served as Senior Writer for *Time*, Editor-in-Chief of *Stonehenge Press* and *American Heritage*, and Assistant Managing Editor for *Time-Life Books*. He is the author and editor of numerous books and publications and has taught and lectured at major universities throughout the country. Mr. Bowen has made various appearances on such television programs as *Johnny Carson's Tonight Show*, the *Today Show*, and *What's My Line*.

W. Edwards Deming
Management Consultant

During a 40-year career, Dr. W. Edwards Deming, a world-renowned

management consultant, has advised governments, private industries, universities, and law firms on applying practical statistical methods to improve production and quality control. The Japanese credit him with revolutionizing their industrial processes, and, in 1951, established the annual Deming Prize in his honor. He has been celebrated and honored throughout the world for his work. Currently, he is Professor of Statistics at the Graduate School of Business Administration, New York University, and a lecturer at Columbia University.

Cleveland Hammonds, Jr.
Superintendent of Schools, Birmingham City Schools, Birmingham, Alabama

Currently Superintendent of Schools for the Birmingham City Schools, Birmingham, Alabama, Dr. Cleveland Hammonds has previously served as Superintendent of Schools in Durham, North Carolina, and Inkster, Michigan. In addition, he has been Assistant Superintendent for the Champaign Public Schools, Champaign, Illinois; a part-time instructor and Assistant Director of Upward Bound at the University of Illinois; and a counselor at Madison High School, Madison, Illinois.

John W. Rosenblum
Dean, Darden School of Business, University of Virginia

Widely regarded as an innovator in business education, Dr. John W. Rosenblum was an instructor and associate professor at Harvard Business School before becoming a professor and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs at the Darden School. He has served as Dean and Sponsors Professor at Darden since 1983. In addition to serving as Director for the American Television and Communications Corporation, Chesapeaker Corporation, and Cadmus Communication Corporation, Dr. Rosenblum serves on several national policy committees, including the GMAC Commission on Admission to Graduate Management Education.

Michael D. Usdan
President, Institute for Educational Leadership

Formerly Connecticut's Commissioner of Higher Education (1978-1981) and President of the Merill Palmer Institute in Detroit, Dr. Michael D. Usdan was appointed president of the prestigious Institute for Educational Leadership in 1981. Dr. Usdan, a Brown University graduate with a Columbia Ph.D., has taught at Columbia, City University of New York, and Northwestern.

Currently, he is a professor at Fordham University, New York. He was a member and president of the school board of New Rochelle, New York, from 1969-1984. Dr. Usdan serves as a consultant to local and state boards of education.

Panel Four

Beverly L. Anderson
Associate Executive Director, Education Commission of the States

Dr. Beverly L. Anderson is currently Associate Executive Director at the Denver-based Education Commission of the States (ESC), an organization that provides state education policymakers with information, research, assistance, and networks to improve state education policy and leadership. In this role, Dr. Anderson focuses on strategies to support state and local policymakers and educators making major changes in the education system. She has served in various capacities at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, including Director of the Denver Field Office, Director of the Assessment and Measurement Program, Assistant Director of the Title I Evaluation Technical Assistant Program, and Senior Research Associate. Dr. Anderson's published works have appeared in over thirty publications and have focused on system change, assessment, school improvement, and policy development.

James M. Cooper
Dean and Commonwealth Professor of Education, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia

Dean and Commonwealth Professor of Education at the Curry School of Education, University of Virginia, Dr. James M. Cooper's previous positions have included Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Houston-University Park; Coordinator of Elementary Education and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, College of Education, University of Houston; Director of Teacher Education, School of Education, University of Massachusetts; and Project Director, Massachusetts Model Elementary Teacher Education Program. Dr. Cooper has also been a lecturer at the School of Education, Stanford University, and a teacher of social studies and English in the public schools of Palo Alto, California.

David Haselkorn
Executive Director, Recruiting New Teachers, Inc.

David Haselkorn serves as Executive Director of Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., a national public service agency that produces ad campaigns designed to attract individuals to teaching careers. He is also Special Assistant for Educational Policy and Initiatives to David Rockefeller, Jr. Previously, Mr. Haselkorn served as an assistant to the presidents of Bradford and Lesley Colleges in Massachusetts and as a research associate with the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching.

Thomas A. Shannon
Executive Director, National School Boards Association

As executive director of the National School Boards Association (NSBA), Dr. Thomas A. Shannon serves a federation of forty-nine state school board associations; the school boards of Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands; as well as nearly 2,000 local school boards that are directly affiliated with NSBA. A lawyer and educator, Dr. Shannon also is a visiting professor of Educational Administration at the University of Virginia and is Executive Publisher of *The American School Board Journal*, *The Executive Educator*, and *School Board News*. He is Advisory Commissioner of the Education Commission of the States, NSBA Liaison to the American Bar Association, a member of the National Advisory Council of Boy Scouts of America, and an executive committee member of the Joint Council on Economic Education in New York.

SHAPING AMERICA'S FUTURE II

A NATIONAL FORUM TO DEVELOP COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO PROVIDING EARLY CHILD CARE AND TRANSFORMING AMERICAN SOCIETY

MR. BLANKSTEIN: Thank you all for coming and welcome to Shaping America's Future II.

This forum is based on the outcome of an earlier meeting, Shaping America's Future I. That meeting was remarkable in that its participants managed to put aside their respective agendas and differences, coalescing in a way rarely seen in order to focus on disadvantaged children. It was momentous in that it was the last national forum attended by the late Chancellor Richard Green. At that event Richard said some things that have stayed with me and are quite applicable to today's meeting.

He said, "We may be the first generation that understands that we are in a period of transformation. How we use our intelligence collectively is going to be the central force behind how we manage that transformation. We have a sense that change needs to take place and it needs to be managed in a way that benefits the common good. We often are paralyzed by inaction, high levels of discussion, and potential outcomes when, in fact, we feel like Nero fiddling while Rome burns.

"The people in this room, who are part of small networks all over this country, have the potential for managing this change. I don't understand--or at least I don't accept--that we can't

transform the schools of this nation in order to ensure our future. I am convinced that if we don't move to the action phase or if we continue to be divided by corporate, public, private, surrogate, mentor, inner-city, and all of the other issues, then it is our own fault.

"We are intelligent enough, we have enough history and experience, to move into the schools and create positive change. The test of our capacity at this moment is: Do we have the courage?

"The question has nothing to do with structure; it has nothing to do with whom is in control; it has nothing to do with governments. It has to do with whether a collective people believe it is important enough to manage change and then have the courage to step forward and do it. The flood gates are wide open."

Everyone in this room has been asked here for a reason. We've invited you because of your experience, your talents, your intelligence, and your ability to convey the outcome of today's meeting to leaders throughout the country. Most importantly, you have been invited here because of your commitment to the millions of children born every year onto a lonely island of poverty and despair, an island surrounded by a vast ocean of prosperity and opulence.

We have in this room the opportunity and the resources to join hands, hearts, and minds for a few hours and to address the needs of those disadvantaged children, to bring a wave of hope to them. With those children in mind and the dream that Richard Green so beautifully articulated, I ask that you give all that you can today

and move toward that goal. Thank you.

DR. MUELLER: Shaping America's Future I came up with four points of collaboration. The initial point was that we needed to have some early childhood intervention specifically related to child care and early childhood education. Second, we needed to develop an ongoing design for collaborative efforts among corporations, legislators, and public and higher school educators. Third, we discussed the need for the development of new training techniques and the institution of a new management leadership concept at both the higher education and local school levels as well as in the corporate structures. The fourth area dealt with the utilization of existing resources in an improved manner so that those resources could deliver services where people need them most.

These four areas of consensus did come to fruition in several ways. One was to agree to come back in Shaping America's Future II to rearticulate the four areas and hopefully come out with a working design for each of them. Therefore, one of our responsibilities today--if not our major responsibility--will be to see if we can come up with a working model for at least one of those areas.

We will try to come up with an action model that we can put into place and make operational through a tangible commitment to support that model. We need to marshall the resources of the National Educational Service Foundation and the collaborative arrangements we formulate today behind the development of these models.

We would need, number one, to come up with a design--hopefully, a generic design--that can be applied around the country, a design for early childhood education or child care on-site. We then can go ahead and give our total support, backing, and assistance to the creation of a successful operating program.

Arvin, will you give us a brief overview of panel one as you see it?

MR. ARVIN MUELLER: We should be spending our time trying to craft and frame some models for collaboration between business, education, and the local administrations. My own feeling is that these models need to be deployed in localities and municipalities around the country. We need to provide some guidance and leadership about what those models may look like and consider what some successful ones are so we can learn from them.

DR. MUELLER: Dr. Shenker, could you give us a brief overview of panel two's objective?

DR. SHENKER: We will be focusing on a model for early childhood education. A lot of work is being done by junior and senior high schools in terms of dropout prevention. There also is a tremendous investment by colleges and corporations in retraining. Many of these efforts are made to compensate for problems created earlier. I don't want to oversimplify the issue, but if we can have effective early childhood education, if youngsters in the sixth grade were reading at the sixth-grade level, many of the problems

question at Shaping America's Future I--that the educational community alone cannot accomplish the task at hand. It will require the resources and efforts of corporations and legislators. It will require higher education and local schools to function as a unit. All of these entities must focus their efforts to produce outcomes for children, for society, and for this nation.

With respect to the child-care aspect of the problem, the current configuration of society is one in which the traditional two-adult family unit is vanishing. Some kind of surrogate relationship for a whole host of children is required in this country. Otherwise, we may be talking about this thing twenty years from now with a society of adults that has had virtually no experience with family relationships.

Child care and early childhood education come into play. We are talking about on-site child care and early childhood education, not just at the corporate level and in the workplace, but within the community as well.

There's no question about the high visibility and apparent appeal that on-site management has generated. There is also no question--or should not be--that effective employment of on-site management is doomed to failure unless there is some consistent training of leaders to conduct that kind of effort. Teachers and community, business, legislative, and higher education leaders need to be interacting to the point where they know what part they play in the total development of the product, namely, the child. Management leadership training has to be reflective of what this country needs at this time in order to develop quality children,

we are confronted with would not be an issue.

DR. MUELLER: John, could you give us an overview of panel three?

DR. ROSENBLUM: As a society, we are investing significant resources in trying to develop business and educational leaders. But we have pursued these initiatives separately. One of the messages ought to be that they should be related. Business leadership particularly ought to have an insight into the challenges of education. And, if educational leadership is not sympathetic to having insight into business, then the kind of collaboration Arvin is talking about will not happen. Our panel has a chance to explore mechanics to improve the education of business and educational leaders.

DR. MUELLER: Tom, what do you see as panel four's task?

DR. SHANNON: Our panel is charged with how to create or build a climate within the local community that is receptive to the models that the other three panels are going to create; that is, how to develop an approach to educating people that is holistic in nature and contemplates a close liaison between education and other social service-providing agencies. It also must do all of this with the cooperation of business, making it a full community effort and not just a school effort.

DR. MUELLER: Thank you. There is no question--and there was no

quality adults, and a quality society.

With respect to service delivery, the fragmentation of the utilization of resources in this country is profound. The fact that we have redundancy in organizations from A to Z is well-known. The fact that service delivery is not the best in the world is also very easy to determine.

We need to have a commitment from schools of higher education to be responsible for their product, not just up to the moment when they turn students out into the field to work with children, but on a continuing basis to make certain that ongoing development is there, that competency continues to improve, and that professionalism is a way of life in the education of our children.

It is now with a great deal of pleasure that I introduce Dr. W. Edward Deming, a consultant in statistical affairs and studies. Dr. Deming is known throughout the world as the father of quality control. He is going to speak to us about the concepts he believes have to be inculcated in the training of managers and leaders in both industry and education.

DR. DEMING: Thank you. There was a time not so long ago when half of the manufactured products made and sold in the world came from this country. Those were days of rugged individualism. The individual, to be sure, did not govern all of his destiny. But if he worked hard, he could make it. And, if he didn't make it in one place, he had a chance to make it somewhere else. There was free land and free opportunity. The individual counted. He could be responsible to himself only.

But what's happened? Forces of ruination have come in. Over a lifetime, from birth to death, these forces squeeze out the individual's intrinsic motivation, his self-esteem, his dignity.

What are these forces of ruination? Let's begin with the examples of grading in school and gold stars for athletics. Five weeks ago when I was in Indianapolis, a little six-year-old girl came home crying. "Why does someone always have to win?" she asked. "Why does someone always have to win?" She was asking why can't we play just for fun? Have we forgotten how to play for fun, how to work for fun?

In essence, children work only for grades and gold stars in school athletics. And, because of that, the joy of learning is smothered. The child is beaten and humiliated. He drops out of school, turns to selling drugs, finds himself in jail.

A professor at the University of Southern California told me that one evening as she took her usual walk along the ocean, she encountered a group of boys and stopped to chat with them. They were all dropouts and, they said, all independent businessmen. They were in the business of selling drugs. They told her that jobs were for foreigners; they were independent.

Yes, the Japanese have grades in school. But let me make this remark. Every Japanese child has a home and parents who can read. All Japanese parents have been through high school. And, the Japanese child is not humiliated. Ever. The Japanese child is a jewel.

In Chicago, a child is released from school at 3:00, he goes home--if he has a home--and finds that no one is there, at least

no one who can read. There's not even a shred of newspaper to read.

Other ruinous forces would include the merit system (both on the job and for teachers), incentive pay, and pay for performance. Each puts people into slots--outstanding, excellent, good, fair, unsatisfactory.

What does the so-called merit system for teachers, for people on the job, do? It makes everybody compete against everyone else. It creates fear, self-defense, competition, and humiliation. And just what is the aim under the merit system? To strive for higher ratings. Never mind the work, just strive for higher ratings.

Surely, we want performance. But incentive pay and pay for performance only crushes performance. People are driven to extrinsic motivation, to a day's pay for a day's work. The merit system crowds out intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, dignity, joy of work and learning. He that enjoys his work is a joy to work with; a child that takes joy in learning is a joy to be with.

So what must we do? We must abolish these forces of ruination. We must develop leadership and cooperation.

But what do I mean by leadership? A leader understands how to work with his group and how the work of his group fits into the aims of the organization. A leader works in cooperation with the earlier and succeeding grades toward optimization of the child. He tries to create interest, challenge, and joy in work and learning for everyone. He tries to optimize everyone's educational skills and abilities. A leader helps everyone to improve.

There are three sources of power. One is simply virtue of

position. The others are knowledge and personality. A successful leader makes use of his knowledge and his personality. And, he has an obligation to use the power of his position to help the system make things different. He cannot duck that responsibility. He cannot rate people. People work in environments, in systems. And, in large part, performance is dictated by the system, not by the individual.

A leader's job--a teacher's job--is to find out who, if anyone, is outside the system and in need of special help, and then to see that the child or worker gets that help. A leader creates trust. He creates freedom for innovation. He has to be aware that creation of trust requires somebody to make the first move. A leader does not expect perfection. He listens and learns without passing judgement on whom he listens to. He understands the benefits of cooperation and the destructive force of competition. Improvement and innovation are the leader's aims.

But from where is innovation to come? In the past, most of it came from the monopolies, companies that were models of strength, guidance, and invincibility. All innovation has come from people and companies that were responsible, and answerable, only to themselves. Unfortunately, we have crushed that out.

We must abolish these forces of ruination. We must develop leadership and cooperation. We must maintain, retain, and expand the intrinsic motivation, the self-esteem, and the dignity with which people are born., We must restore the individual. The problem is: Do we have the courage to do it?

Are there any questions?

MR. BOWEN: You refer many times to the negative value of competition in school, athletics, and the classroom. Don't we really want to encourage the desire to contribute to win, but to put the winning aside in a concept of contributing to the common will?

DR. DEMING: Of course, certainly.

DR. ZIGLER: I'm a little befuddled. I agree that the driving out of intrinsic motivation has been absolutely devastating to American children, and I applaud what you're saying. But I am also totally aware that you're swimming against the stream. As this movement of accountability moves forward, we're seeing more and more grading and testing of children. We're going further and further down the grade levels in terms of evaluation of performance. We now test children at the ages of four and five. How is it possible to turn this around since the country seems to
be in the throes of a requirement that says we have to evaluate everyone?

DR. DEMING: That's not quite so. I get an average of two to three letters a week from companies that have abolished the merit system. However, basically what you say is correct. That does not mean it's right. We'll simply need courage to turn it around.

DR. MUELLER: Thank you, Dr. Deming. Unfortunately, we're going

to have to break in order to get into panels. So if you could all move into your groups, we can get under way.

(A three-hour recess for individual panel discussions and lunch.)

DR. MUELLER: Keith Geiger, would you be kind enough to start us off with a report from panel one?

MR. GEIGER: First, we got into a rather interesting discussion revolving around the fact that the problem in some areas may be so insurmountable that the best thing would be to give up. When you talk about the problems of education, it is probably easy to see why there are some people out there that have just given up. But that is not a luxury that any of us can afford. We cannot give up on the problem no matter how great it is.

Another question came up that I found absolutely interesting, and that is: Why is it that we have to wait until the twelfth hour to understand that there are real problems? We're almost at the twelfth hour; we're going to have to have some miracles happen pretty soon.

But we're not sure that the business community and the population in general really believe there are problems or that they, in fact, believe that we need all of the youngsters. That poses a problem if we don't all come to the conclusion that we do need all of our youngsters.

To improve education for all youngsters, we need to consider whether we still concentrate too much on the end product. We worry

about kids when they reach fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen years of age and discover that they don't have enough math or science. We begin to worry only when they get into college and need remedial classes.

We have to put a concerted effort on preschool, on good day-care programs. How are we dealing with youngsters at ages two, three, and four, especially those from deprived areas, the at-risk youngsters? If we concentrate more of our time and energy on kids in kindergarten to third grade, then maybe we wouldn't have to invest so much time and money when our children get into the seventh and eighth grade, into high school and college.

The last thing we discussed was that the education community has traditionally not invited nor made the government and business communities feel as if they were welcome as partners in improving our schools. We have done a lot to change that over the last four or five years, but we have to do even more to make business and government aware that we, as educators, truly believe that they are part of the process. We ought to work more with these groups to make public education--or education in general--better for all youngsters. The more activities we work on together, the better off all of us will be.

We then listed some areas where we believe the business, education, and legislative communities can be more helpful to each other. One of these is having the business community set requirements. I don't think we still know what the business community wants or needs. We need to sit down and have the business community tell us what its requirements are, find out what

the kids have to know when they graduate from high school in order to get a job. The business community needs to be more involved in school boards and in talking about the whole politics of the schools and the business place. We also will need the help of the business community if we are going to pass legislation.

The whole idea of internships with corporations goes back to the idea of the business community being involved. If we could find a way for people in the education community to work in the business community for a month or two during the summer, then not only will the business community be able to tell educators what is best for them to teach, educators will know firsthand what the kids out there have to know.

I believe that school-based management, site-based decision-making, is one place where the business community can be very helpful to those in education. There has been much success in producing a quality work life in the business community, so business people can be very helpful to the education community on that.

Another idea is that teachers must become role models again. This goes back to Dr. Deming's idea of self-esteem. Many educators over the last twenty to thirty years have felt they have become more of a worker than a professional. Sometimes we react to that in negative ways. So, we have to increase educators' positions as role models to youngsters in the school.

We also need to talk about demographics, data, the ever-increasing minority student population, the decreasing minority teacher population, where the population is growing, and where it

is declining. The federal and state governments do very little in the area of research, data gathering, and development to help show the whole trend of education, where we ought to be going.

In addition, we discussed the idea of decentralization of schools, something being talked about in Chicago. We believe that is one area the government can help to define.

DR. MUELLER: Thank you. Group number two?

DR. SHENKER: Our group moved pretty far from the specific charge we were given, which was building a model for on-site child care and a number of subdivisions. We approached the problem in a more global manner and came up with a package that I think makes a great deal of sense.

The whole child-care issue is fundamentally linked to the family. The family structure that now exists in the United States is radically different than the all-American family concept. The notion of two biological children living with their parents, the husband going to work and the mother staying home with the kids, doesn't exist anymore. Data I have seen indicates that that model represents only ten percent of American families at this point. So, that places enormous pressure on the whole discussion of child care. What are reasonable expectations for the American family in respect to child care?

A second point is that our educational system as it now works was created fundamentally to serve an agricultural society. We no longer are an agricultural society, and so the system has to

change.

Third, child care must be thought of as being a quality service to young people, not just as a matter of easing the burden on the working mother or father by having a baby sitter available. We must try to lead to a position of quality care for our young people.

The last point we discussed is that corporations should be viewing their role as providers of employee-friendly policies regarding child care--for example, establishing flexible hours, whatever is appropriate. But corporations should not be the ones taking on the burden of early childhood education. If they have on-site care, fine. If it works with their employees in that particular location, no one would be opposed to that. But the thrust is not to look to the corporations to provide the quality of education we feel is necessary. Our plan calls for a fundamental and systematic change in the educational system of this country.

The components of our plan are these:

The school should be open from roughly 7:00 in the morning to 10:00 at night. It should have early childhood education as part of its regular programming structure, and these programs should focus on the years three, four, and five. The school also should support a network of arrangements, whatever exists in the local community, to serve as well the youngsters zero to three years old. The school should be providing an information and training program for all parents, starting with pregnancy. It should reach out to parents to make sure they are true participants in the educational

process. If necessary, the school should create new programs or build upon whatever is currently in place to accomplish these ends.

To create this structure, we will need advocacy and a spokesperson on the national level. Our suggestion is an annual White House conference on children that looks not just at education, but at all the needs of all the children, including nutrition, health care, and all the other childhood needs you could list. We're also talking about a huge expansion of training and education for people who work in the child-care field. The corporations should take on a role of advocacy for this entire package and support this arrangement, not in terms of short-term planning of structures to help existing employees, but more in terms of real development of human capital for the future.

Of course, we cannot ask the existing educational system to take on this entire array of new responsibilities without a proper level of support and implementation of a plan phased in over time, allowing it to be absorbed in a qualitative manner over a certain number of years.

DR. MUELLER: Thank you. Panel three?

DR. ROSENBLUM: We tried to focus on two elements of leadership. We tried first to paint a vision of what we thought leadership, education, and development ought to be in the United States five to ten years from now, what we'd like our system to look like a decade from now, not just in education, but also in business and government. Business, education, and government must, in a sense,

share insight and empathy for each other's tasks. We'd like to see a world in which we all shared common educational and other principle goals. We'd like to see a collective strategy in this commitment.

The last hour of our conversation involved trying to think through some specific actions that would make it possible for us to move from where we are to this point in the next ten years. We decided that we have to focus national conversations about this. We have to mobilize the elite of all the sectors--education, government, and business--and try to set an agenda for exploring the roles of the state, federal, and local governments. Within that national conversation, we would think of some specifics, and then decide how to get this conversation translated from the national scene to a more local and, hopefully, more operational level.

First, we want to encourage universities and colleges to serve as venue, an energizing and catalytic force for conversations on local levels, conversations that parallel the national conversation.

But we can't talk about common education and experience unless there is more systematic data, more common definitions of problems. So, there is a need for a pilot project or experiment to create common data for us all to understand what dropout rates mean, for instance. Do we have the same definition in all of our information?

Third, we discussed the need to provide information between deans of schools and universities to create the future educational

leadership of this country. The education, business, government, and legislative communities need to talk together about ways to develop a common curriculum. Up to this point, this has been pursued independently. You have in front of you a paper that Jim presented as part of our conversations in Virginia. This is our beginning of that kind of pilot project. [See Appendix.]

Our fourth point concerns this: Could we have more organized experiments or pilot projects where public school educators can gain experience in business and the business community can gain experience in the public schools? With this exchange, we could learn more about each other.

We also wondered if businesses should be encouraged to endow key school leadership positions much in the same way they endow key professions in universities. They should encourage the best and brightest young talent to commit to careers in education, much like in business and government leadership.

Finally, we discussed whether or not to promote experience in corporations and require public service. What kinds of required public service for business managers and graduate students could we build into the curriculum? Again, this should be done with the spirit of sharing of experience so that the architects of educational programs--and the leaders of those programs--have insight into the world in which their students will have to live and work. Those of us in the world of government and business will then have a greater insight into what is facing the educational community. It is not a question of business telling the educational community what to do better or the educational

community telling the same thing to business or government. There should be a sense of a shared collective and cooperative approach to its resolution.

DR. MUELLER: Thank you. And now, panel four.

DR. SHANNON: Among the issues that we discussed were the effective delivery of social service resources--education being just a part of those resources--and the responsibilities of higher education and local schools for the development of professionalism and the continued upgrading of the teaching profession.

There are three barriers to the approach that we think is necessary. The first of these is the values barrier; second, the structural and bureaucratic barrier; and third, the budgetary barrier.

Of the three, the values barrier is the one that should be addressed most significantly because the other two are expressions of the values barrier. The will of the people has to be shifted from a notion of indiscriminate use of resources to valuing resources highly. The need for trust in teachers, greater accountability, and curriculum mandates shows that the trend is toward placing faith and trust in people. That is necessary to bring down the barriers we have identified.

There is a need to approach the issues in a holistic manner. The whole child is important. It is, after all, the whole child who is being educated. Addressing the health problems of children and their various other social needs is the best and most

expeditious and efficient way of getting to the root of the problem.

We should focus more on the delivery help rather than simply service. Knowledge is more important than grading, and we should change the idea that schools weed out people rather than cultivate them.

To get people to resonate about these issues and to get them fired up enough to do something about them, it is necessary to change the climate, not from any kind of edict imposed, but within the community itself. The school board should accept primary responsibility for building this climate by working with business and labor within the community. It is important, first, to recognize the problem locally; second, to state the problem well; and third, to address the problem directly under local conditions. People have to have local community recognition that there is a problem in order to do something about it.

You have to get people to focus on children who are lost in the system, the disadvantaged youngsters in particular. This is not being done because people are in any way mean-spirited or don't want to do anything, but because so many people don't recognize that these youngsters exist.

Dr. Deming said that we are, in his mind and view, in deep trouble already. Our guess is that if you talk to a cross-section of people, you would not come up with the dark picture he has painted. So, it's the old saying that challenges people with vision and knowledge--if it ain't broke, don't fix it. A lot of people think that our educational system is not broken, whereas

the informed minds tell us that, indeed, it is broken or is so close to being broken that we have to do something about it now. And this has to be done in the local communities, not from on high.

Another issue we discussed is professionalism; that is, redesigning the educational preparation program for teachers. We should look at the way school education is being restructured, and then decide whether these programs are concerned about the mix of pedagogy and our schools' sociology and psychology, whether they are providing enabling skills that make teachers better teachers.

In the local community and in our universities, we have to come to terms with pluralism in our society. Clearly, the way to secure more minority teachers is through recruitment services, services for more on-the-job training, and a good mentor program. Mentoring teachers is a very important project. But the mentoring has to be done without the evaluation components. When people both evaluate and mentor, the approach often does not last.

As to local schools and their role in continuing to upgrade the performance and competency of teachers, again, school boards have to set the environment. If they set the environment, they are able to sell the idea to the people. This will embolden the administrative leadership and is absolutely critical to success. The school administration, from the superintendent to principals, has to have the confidence and support to do the kind of work that its supposed to do. There also has to be support from colleges. That goes back to what Dr. Deming calls solid leadership.

We talked as well about how one of the problems with many teachers coming into schools with many at-risk kids is that they

come in with, not naivete, but very high expectations and hopes for short-term rewards. In fact, the short-term rewards often don't come. Very few youngsters will be taken from a broken home with no supervision and, by the miraculous work of the teacher, in one year be positioned on the road to Harvard or Yale. But, something sometimes does happen. Teachers have to continue to keep their expectations high. But, at the same time, they must be satisfied with more long-term rewards.

So, we have to change our attitudes about how teachers approach the youngsters. For example, we have to allocate teachers' time to work with social workers. One of our social worker participants particularly decried the fact that in order for her to work effectively, it is necessary to build personal relationships over a long period of time. She said she didn't have the time to do that. There has to be some leadership by the principals to enable the social worker to be more accepted into the school environment.

Local schools should work with other local schools and with colleges to help design preparation programs. Collaboration is the byword. Also involved, of course, should be the city and community people in charge of other social services, as well as business and the community-at-large. You gain a lot by having that participation, not only in terms of expertise, but in terms of an imprimatur. The effort goes a long way toward building support within the community, which buttresses the board's role.

DR. MUELLER: Thank you, Tom. And now we will open the floor to

any questions or comments concerning our panelists' conclusions.

DR. ZIGLER: I see a commonality between what was discussed by panel four and what we did in panel two, a commonality that could well be the core product of this meeting. That commonality is this: We have circumvented the child much too much.

We have a meeting dealing just with education when we should be taking a whole-child approach. Our goal ought to be the optimal development of every child across the broad array of developmental phenomena.

When you take optimal human development as your goal, you immediately discover that there are four major systems that determine child development. The most important one is the family. The other three are the school, the child-care system that the child engages in, and the health system. Addressing all of these systems is going to require a major change in the American school. The overall feeling then is that a band-aid approach is not going to work. We need something very major, and it's got to be built into the very social fabric.

The plan that Joe Shenker laid out of the new American school hits through to the family-support component. It takes care of early childhood education, which was talked so much about in Shaping America`s Future I and is coming up again this time. The plan also is wise enough not to make the mistake often made in this country in recent years; that is, to look for a magical head-start year when development supposedly starts taking place.

That's why the plan for a new school is a program that begins

at pregnancy and involves home visitation before the child ever begins school. It has early childhood education for ages three to five and before- and after-school care for years six to fourteen. The plan for a new school does away with the latchkey children, a real blight on the face of our society.

Talking about a new American school is really a massive step forward. Twelve models of the school already exist in Missouri. Connecticut has several, as does Wyoming. This is the right time for a body of this sort to say that this is an idea whose time has come. And, of course, through this system we would finally at long last take care, really, of the most pressing problem of the American family today and a very pressing problem of the private sector, namely, child care.

MR. GEIGER: I think what we're doing here is not redefining the American school, but redefining American society because the school part of that may or may not be separate. We're redefining the federal, state, and local responsibilities to a society that, up to this point, we have not been willing to face. We're at a break point. The time is ripe for us to redefine everything.

DR. COOPER: Many of us here are convinced that this kind of fundamental restructuring is necessary. But I am not certain that the leaders and local policymakers in many school districts throughout the country are convinced of it.

We have a university school partnership at the University of Virginia. Its purpose is the simultaneous renewal of the education

of educators and the restructuring of the schools. We work with about ten different school districts. I've worked with these districts' superintendents for three years now. Out of the ten, possibly two of them are truly interested in restructuring the schools. The others are not interested at all. To them, school improvement means only incremental changes, not a fundamental restructuring. A lot of them are simply concerned about making mistakes and errors. And, they are not getting any messages from their school boards or their communities that fundamental restructuring is necessary.

I recognize that there are school districts in this country where the communities and their school boards are saying that fundamental restructuring is necessary. But, I would venture to guess that they're in the minority. In the majority of this nation's 15,000 school districts, the message about major restructuring is not being communicated. When that message is not there, we're going to see only a tinkering around the edges and incidental improvements not of major overall significance.

DR. ZIGLER: When I travel around the country, I do find people ready for change. They just don't have the money to be able to do it.

One of the things we need is a time frame for change. The way I think it's going to happen, which would meet your legitimate concerns, is a kind of experimental approach. In Missouri, they started something called Parents as Teachers. It is a home-visitation program in which the schools send people into the home

to be parent educators and supporters. Never before has this occurred in our schools. This program was started in four schools and received such overwhelming support that parents in the next district said, hey, we have got to have that. The program went from four sites to every single school in Missouri within a period of three years.

That is the way to proceed, to start with a network of models around the states in every state. Now, again, you have to be careful to remember that you do not do this for free. This is a very costly job. The fees needed to pay for this will probably be so great that poor families needing the services most will have to somehow be subsidized. Businesses possibly could help with the start-up money.

The good news is that a bill that is in committee, HR-3, has now moved from the Education Committee into Ways and Means. It looks as if the bill that is going to be voted on will provide a kitty of about 500 million dollars to start these schools nationally. It also will provide an increase in Title XX money, which in turn will provide the child-care money for the poor kids who will be using the new schools that provide both child care and education.

So, the strategy may well be to put something out there so appealing to people that they simply will have to have it, and then realize that even if we do succeed, we're talking about a process that may take twenty years.

DR. MUELLER: I agree that the problem won't wait for us to agree

that it needs help. When the urban problem becomes explosive, as I believe it will, people are going to have a different view of what is necessary. It might not be necessary for their personal school district, but it may be a requirement for other districts that are not as well off educationally, socially, or financially.

I don't know if we can wait for these conditions to change for those not in tune with reality to catch up before action is taken. We have to get this thing going some way so that the needs of this growing segment of our society are addressed for the benefit of the entire country.

DR. MECKLOWITZ: I think society has already given us a mandate, though not uniformly, that they want the schools restructured. They hold the schools accountable for drug problems. They hold the schools responsible for the good nutrition of their populations and for social, psychiatric, and guidance services. They hold the schools responsible to stop the spread of AIDS, for the education of the preschool child, and on and on and on.

The answer has to be that we must willingly accept the responsibility thrust upon us. There is no other agency within the community that is so large that it can accept the full range of responsibilities. This does not mean that we subsume the responsibilities of the community-based organizations, the universities, and the other agencies that are participating. It means we develop a structure that has the school at its center.

We begin by adapting the schools for the acceptance of those younger children, which becomes a palatable move for the corporate

structure. We do this in two ways. One is short term. It provides the corporate structure with a medium to take care of the children of its employees. The long-term effect is that it will provide the corporations with that cadre of well-educated adults that they need to take care of the offices, the management structure, and, indeed, to carry out the business that they are engaged in.

So, I think the mandate is already out there. The demands are already there. What we're saying now is that a plan has to be developed to carry this out over a twenty-year period, a plan with some immediate quick gains that will be acceptable, and then a series of gains down the line that will gradually enhance the quality of that offering.

DR. SHANNON: The mandate is not equally applicable or equally problematic across the country. There are 15,000 local school districts in the United States, but only about 700 have more than a 2,000-student enrollment. About a hundred or so have the enrollment of urban areas, which represents somewhere between twenty and twenty-five percent of all youngsters.

When you talk to school board members across the United States about restructuring and about teacher empowerment, you're talking in very vague terms for one thing. Those terms conjure up different images to different people. But we tend to talk about all school districts as if we have a very monolithic kind of institution. In fact, we don't. School districts operate under fifty different state and territorial laws. So, you can't talk

generally.

I'm not saying there's not a lot of work to be done. A lot of work has been done and is being done on an ongoing basis. The problem is getting the information to make the case for so many school districts across the country.

MR. HASELKORN: We then need a call for a more focused strategy. I forget the numbers, but something like four percent of school districts in the United States educate forty to forty-three percent of the kids. In support of the point made about the need to differentiate between districts and unique problems, I would argue that instead of defusing the energies politically, we need to invest in a much more focused strategy and emphasize programs where they are most needed, the urban centers of the United States. Instead of taking on the whole universe, it's more important to focus on the forty to forty-five school districts where sixty percent of the kids are and where the really acute problems exist, the urban metropolitan areas. That not only creates a more viable political base, it does not defuse political energy.

DR. MECKLOWITZ: But there is universality among school districts in terms of working mothers as part of intact families and those who are part of single-parent households. That transcends the big cities and could be the issue with which we could begin the restructuring of schools instead of just around a maze of general issues. If we begin with the implementation of schools for three-year-olds and the beginnings of better child-care facilities from

birth to the third year, then the other pieces will fall into place. Once you begin to keep your schools open until 6:00 or 10:00 in the evening, you will begin to see the array of services that can begin to fall into place, services that will be more than acceptable in the smallest or the largest communities.

DR. MUELLER: The focus on the urban may well be a necessary condition, but to suggest that that need does not exist throughout this country, I think, is incorrect.

MR. HASELKORN: I'm not suggesting that. I was saying you need a point of entry, a point of emphasis, not to take on this whole diffused enterprise generically.

MR. BLANKSTEIN: There is an advantage to broadening the scope in that it appeals to people who then can make financial decisions in favor of everyone across the board.

DR. HAMMONDS: I'm not sure there's a consensus yet on child care. I think I'll believe that when I see resources directed toward that area. So far, there's only a certain group of people talking about it, a lot of initiatives. But I have not seen any substantial funds moving in that direction yet. I don't see the groundswell. I see only a lot of intellectual interaction at this point.

DR. MUELLER: We may not have the financing for it, but the question of the change in society is an absolute. In a school

district as affluent as the one that I retired from, sixty-two percent of the parents in the community were heads of single-adult families. When I look at that kind of condition, the latchkey problem that it develops, there is no way you can ignore the fact that this is universal throughout the United States.

DR. ZIGLER: There was just a poll done by Philip Morris in which seventy percent of the respondents felt that child care ought to be taken care of by the schools. In absolute numbers, parents themselves are paying on the order of thirty million dollars a year buying their own child care. They have to. The federal government has the tax write-off for the middle class, paying four billion a year. Title XX child care for the poor is another 600 million dollars a year. A new bill before Congress may give us about a billion dollars. So, things are beginning to move.

But I want to come back to the idea that we ought to do something nationally because the problem is a national problem. As I move around, the real concern is in the inner city. If you look at the Council for Economic Development, people are terribly concerned about Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles, Kansas City, and so on. But it's a money problem. You can get money if you restructure the schools in suburbia because parents can afford to pay the price for new early childhood and child-care services. The problems come in the inner city where the parents have no money and where there is no subsidation monies, except Title XX, which doesn't pick up all the costs.

And, if you put out a few models, do you locate them where

they're the easiest to put into place and the most cost-effective or where they are the hardest to begin? In Connecticut, they developed three models--one in suburbia, one in rural Connecticut, and one in Hartford's inner city. That might be a model we could use.

DR. COOPER: Last night at dinner, Cleveland Hammonds happened to mention something that I found intriguing. Someone asked him how he went about implementing the changes he made in the Birmingham schools. He said that the first thing he did was not to label anything. He didn't call it restructuring. He didn't call it anything. He just made improvements. In labeling changes, you tend to set up opposition and resistance to what the labels conjure up in people's minds.

DR. HAMMONDS: You force people to consider each component and then possibly disagree with the component. If you give it a name, then they can be against a program. You find yourself defending the whole concept rather than dealing with something in the program that may not be as good as it ought to be.

DR. MUELLER: Unfortunately, when we do use that approach, other folks sometimes provide a label for us.

DR. HAMMONDS: I am still troubled by talking about child care and early childhood education as though they are the same concept in the public's mind. In the minds of many people I talk to, child

care is a custodial rather than an educational program. And I think each, though closely related, ought to take advantage of every opportunity to have early intervention.

MR. BLANKSTEIN: Interesting point. I was reading the Washington Post ABC Public Opinion Poll, and I think fifty-four percent of the people were in favor of corporations and other community-based organizations taking on the early child-care role. But only twenty-two percent of the people approved of actually providing child-care education. Thirty-six percent were against it and thirty-nine percent didn't care. So, there's really no consensus with regard to teaching the kids. All were in favor of taking the kids off their hands, but many felt it was a negative idea to actually educate them in a context outside the home.

MR. GEIGER: We go on about the business of child care, and suddenly discover that we have built a lot of buildings, but that parents are not taking their children to the buildings. They want a child-care facility in the factory or the workplace. It's going to take collaboration between the business and education communities to solve that problem.

We have data that indicates, especially for high-risk youngsters, that we have to put quality child care, not just baby-sitting, into place, else we are spending a lot of money for nothing.

DR. MUELLER: When I talk with corporate people, their first

position is that they don't want to be responsible for child care. Their next response, however, is that that's delightful. But I don't think many educators want corporations to take over the responsibility entirely because they don't want to be ruled out of the process. Still other educators say that they have more to do than they possibly can handle already. But if we had the resources, and were able to put the programs together in an appropriate way, that might be something educators could and probably should take on.

DR. RANDALL: For businesses that start child-care programs, child care becomes a perk for the employee. The parent likes to have the child there. But the bigger picture is: What is right for the child? Much of the discussion at this point has centered on addressing the needs of the whole child and what is required to fulfill those needs. So we ought to be clear about why child care should be in the domain of business or in that of the school.

THE AUDIENCE: I am a representative of NYNEX. I feel that there are two sides to the story. Some studies have shown that the employees would prefer to have their children on the business premises, but others have shown that is not the case at all. For the benefit of the child and the employees, these studies have found that child care closer to home was better.

Another point I would like to make is this: It seems in this country what we have done is to develop our organizations around contents like education or health, something we're to deliver to

the people. We do not have an organizational structure that places the responsibility for preschool children with anyone.

So, there is no wholeness of delivery that focuses on children. Each organization is more responsible for delivering some content. We're finding that because of that gap, we keep trying to add pieces of tasks to everyone's job. Somehow or another we have to get to the point where every organization sees first and foremost that they have education and learning. But then among, between, or within organizations we have to have a strategy that collectively gives shared responsibility for the children. We have not yet figured that strategy out.

DR. MECKLOWITZ: The issue is continuity of education for children, continuity between what happens at the three-year-old level, the four-year-old level, and then the five-year-old level when the child starts kindergarten.

It doesn't matter whether the program is housed at the corporate level, at a community-based organization, or anywhere else. There has to be a body of knowledge out there that is enhancing what is presented and is the possession of the deliverer of the service. If those people are trained and ready to deliver the service for three-year-olds, four-year-olds, and five-year-olds, then the product when students are eighteen years old and ready to move on is going to be an infinitely better product than what we're talking about. That continuity is more important than where it's going to be placed.

The studies have shown that when you get a pregnant woman

involved in what is happening in school, you'll develop a person that can very easily be motivated. You're going to get a more interested and more knowledgeable parent. You can begin a process where you're going to provide real child care, not just custodial care.

DR. MUELLER: Another major issue is that a whole body of our population has grown up and is now of child-bearing age that has had no parental guidance or development of any kind, no insight on how to handle children, how to rear them, educate them, do virtually anything with them. That population has to be treated in some way, shape, or form until they get out of the child-bearing age. There is no question in my mind that wherever those sites are, those parents are going to be part of the establishment. Their training is essential to the outcome of today's kids.

MR. BLANKSTEIN: We have been talking about long-term plans, short-term plans, and models. What do we do after this meeting? Where do we go from here with regard to what you have been discussing today? What are you willing to do toward that end?

DR. ROSENBLUM: We would like to try to figure out a way to take what each of us has discussed and take it down to a level of practicality that would allow us to do it. On behalf of Jim Cooper and the University of Virginia, we would be delighted to encourage Cleveland Hammonds to identify men and women in his organization that he thinks have leadership potential to join us and, hopefully,

some corporate friends of the university to create an educational program for those potential educational leaders at the university. The program would not be one that Jim, Cleve, the corporations, or I design independently. We would be joint architects of that endeavor and would use it as a laboratory experiment. I hope that we'll make some progress and be able to report.

DR. MECKLOWITZ: Basically, the only thing we wanted to make you aware of is the strong feeling that early childhood education is a continuum. We're not talking about disparate things when we speak about child care and early childhood education. We consider them one and the same, each part related to the other in a series of learning. One educational level builds upon the other, culminating in the total package at the end of grade twelve.

As far as next steps are concerned, I think we put together a package that is quite clear. It has to now be broken down into a series of phases. We have to kick off with the President's Conference on Education and highlight the restructuring of schools. That's extremely important.

MR. GEIGER: We need some people from powerful business positions to be actively involved in the testimony on quality child care at the national, state, and local levels. We have to have somebody like Lee Iacocca's organization testifying in support of quality child care.

DR. ZIGLER: The fact is that when bodies like this meet, we have

to deal with data that is insufficient. For the last fifteen years we have seen a withering away of data collection, and that makes the kind of planning that this body needs to do impossible.

Now, what makes it even sadder is that we have by law an entity, the United States Children's Bureau, which is supposed to be observing the social scene for children and families, collecting the data necessary for forward planning. The Children's Bureau also used to head the White House Conference on Children every ten years. If that body would be functioning properly, bodies such as this one would not be necessary. We are filling a vacuum.

The new chief of the Children's Bureau, Wade Horn, is much more receptive than anyone who has held that position in the last ten years. I suggest that, with the wisdom of those attending this discussion today, a letter be sent to the Children's Bureau pointing out the concerns we have about the lack of available data to bodies of this type. That would be very helpful.

MR. BLANKSTEIN: It's been a very productive afternoon. I asked initially that we move toward the action phase; I feel that we have made great strides toward that. We're on the right road and now we'll take the ball and run with it. Thank you very much for coming.